

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending. Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected. Claims 4-7 and 9-21 are allowed. Claims 22-42 were canceled.

Claim Objections / Rejections

Claims 1-3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giebel et al. (US 5,863,083) (Giebel) and further in view of Heagy et al. (US 2002/0033554) (Heagy). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites *inter alia* "a pulling grip housing for receiving and temporarily storing the furcation plug, the fiber optic connectors and the ends of the respective optical fibers, the pulling grip housing having a first housing portion defining an elongate channel for routing the optical fibers and a second housing portion defining a plurality of pockets, each pocket for storing a plurality of the fiber optic connectors". Geibel and Heagy are silent with respect to a pulling grip housing having a first housing portion defining an elongate channel for routing the optical fibers and a second housing portion defining a plurality of pockets, each pocket for storing a plurality of the fiber optic connectors. It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Specifically, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Additionally, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F2d 488 and MPEP 706.02(j). Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Geibel or Heagy et al. for "a pulling grip housing having a first housing portion defining an elongate channel for routing the optical fibers and a second housing portion defining a plurality of pockets, each pocket for storing a plurality of the fiber optic connectors".

Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over the cited art. Claims 2-3 depend from patentable base Claim 1, and thus, are likewise allowable for at least the same reasons.

With respect to independent Claim 8, Geibel and Heagy do not describe or suggest a second housing portion defining a plurality of pockets, wherein each pocket is for storing a plurality of the fiber optic connectors. Rather, Geibel describes slots (42) which are clearly shown as each housing only a single connector (20).

For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully request that the 103 rejection of Claims 1-3 and 8 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection(s) and the rejection(s) of the claims and to reconsider the application. This Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated June 30, 2005 and places the application in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowability for the pending claims. Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned directly to further the prosecution of any remaining issues, and thereby expedite allowance of the application.

This Amendment does not result in more independent or total claims than paid for previously. Accordingly, no fee for excess claims is believed to be due. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any fee due in connection with the filing of this response, including any excess claims fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-2167. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not already accounted for, such an extension is requested and the fee should likewise be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2167. Any overpayment should be credited to Deposit Account No. 19-2167.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas M. Fisher
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,564
P. O. Box 489
Hickory, N. C. 28603
Telephone: 828/901-6431
Facsimile: 828/901-5206

Dated: September 22, 2005